



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/579,792	05/26/2000	Roger Flores	PALM-2940.US.P	8499

7590 12/11/2003
Wagner Murabito & Hao LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

CHUNG, DANIEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2672

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TS

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/579,792

Applicant(s)

FLORES ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel J Chung

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-21 are presented for examination. Claim 21 has been added by the amendment filed on 9-26-2003. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 9-26-2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muta (6,448,958) in view of Nagai et al (5,483,631), and further in view of Zelinsky et al (4,837,710).

Regarding claim 1, Muta discloses that the claimed feature of in a computer system, a method of displaying information, comprising the steps of:

a) accessing a flag ["capability information"; 413] indicating a display mode of a display screen [211,220] of a computer system [210+240], wherein display mode [W/B, multi gradation, color] indicates a display capability of display screen; b) an application program [210,215] of computer system making a call ["input information", 309] to

Art Unit: 2672

request a display attribute [i.e. color] for an object to be displayed on display screen [211,220]; c) in response to request, indexing a table [320] with flag and an object identifier [315] to obtain a display attribute ["rendering instruction", 331], wherein object identifier identifies object, and wherein table is located externally of application program [210,215] and comprises a list of object identifiers and a plurality of display attribute lists, each of display attribute lists having a display attribute associated with each of object identifiers, wherein at least two of display attribute lists correspond to display capabilities of display screen; d) application program displaying object on display screen [211,220] with display attribute [331], wherein display capability of display screen is transparent to application program. (See Abstract, Fig 3, Fig 4, Fig 6, Fig 11, col 2 line 26-47, col 13 line 17-45)

Muta does not specifically disclose that "a flag indicating a display mode of a display screen". However, using of a flag is well-known in the art to represent a information as a marker of some type used by a computer in processing or interpreting information. (See "Microsoft Computer Dictionary", third edition) Therefore, this would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to use flag into the teaching of Muta, as using of flag is advantageously desirable in Muta's system for effectively indicating "capability information."

Also, Muta does not explicitly disclose that indexing a table, which comprises a list of object identifiers and an associated display attribute lists. However, such

limitations are shown in the teaching of Nagai et al ["display identifier", "attribute data" in "display data table"] (See Abstract, Fig 3, Fig 4, Fig 7, Fig 11, col 1 line 63-col 2 line 17) It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include the above "display data table" of Nagai's system into the teaching of Muta, in order to provide "the communication quantity between the network manager and the display unit can be reduced and the display unit can easily identify the corresponding component element on the communication network screen using the display identifier" (See col 7 line 1-12 in Nagai, Also See col 9 line 37-45, col 10 line 19-39), as such improvement is also advantageously desirable in the teaching of Muta for rendering optimized image upon the display device effectively.

Also, the combination of Muta and Nagai do not specifically disclose that "at least two of display attribute lists correspond to display capabilities of display screen." However, such limitation is shown in the teaching of Zelinsky et al. ["color/attribute table", "attribute translation table"; 4-28, which include two display attribute lists ["monochrome attributes", "color display attributes"] corresponds to display capabilities of display screen ["monochrome screen", "color screen"] (See Abstract, Fig 2, Fig 3, Fig 5A-5F, Fig 6A-6E, col 1 line 40-col 2 line 27) It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate the teaching of Zelinsky into the teaching of Muta and Nagai, in order to effectively provide proper display attribute corresponding to the display device's type, as such improvement is also advantageously desirable in the teaching of Muta and Nagai for rendering the optimized image upon its type of display device.

Regarding claim 2, Muta discloses that plurality of display attribute lists comprise a first and a second, and wherein:

First display attribute list has all of its associated display attributes being color ["color image"]; Second display attribute list has all of its associated display attributes being monochrome ["2 gradations W/B"]. (See col 9 line 8-15)

Regarding claim 3, Muta discloses that plurality of display attribute lists comprise a third, and where third display attribute list has all of its associated display attributes being a gray scale value ["multi gradations W/B"]. (See Fig 11)

Regarding claim 4, refer to the discussion for the claim 1 hereinabove, Zelinsky et al discloses that display attribute lists has all of its associated display attributes as being colors which are substantially different from each other, such that debugging application program is facilitated. (See Fig 3, Fig 4B)

Regarding claim 5, Muta discloses that the step of application program [210] changing at least one of the display attributes in at least one of display attribute lists. (See Fig 3, Fig 11; Also See Fig 3, Fig 4, Fig 7, Fig 11 in Nagai)

Regarding claim 6, Muta discloses that the step of application program causing changes to the display attributes to remain in effect when the next application program runs. (See Fig 3, Fig 11)

Regarding claim 7, Muta discloses that the step of each time the computer system starts up, assigning a random color to each undefined color [default], such that if the application program changes one of display attributes to one of undefined colors, then the display attribute of object displayed on display screen is likely to be different each time the computer system starts up. (See Fig 3, Fig 11)

Regarding claim 8, Muta discloses that the step of a user of computer system changing display mode. (See Abstract line 1-9, col 13 line 26-32)

Regarding claim 9, Muta discloses that color table resides in an operating system of computer system. (See Fig 3, Fig 11)

Regarding claim 10, Claim 10 is the corresponding computer system of claim 1. Thus, the rejection to claim 1 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 10.

Regarding claims 11-12, Muta disclose that computer system is a portable/palm sized computer system. (See Abstract line 3)

Regarding claims 13-20, claims 13-20 are similar in scope to the claims 1-18, and thus the rejections to claims 1-18 hereinabove are also applicable to claims 13-20.

Regarding claim 21, Muta discloses that application program changes the at least one of the display attributes in the at least one of display attribute lists without user interaction ['changing color attribute data based upon capability information']. (See Fig 3, Fig 4)

Claims 1-20 are once again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muta (6,448,958) in view of Rhyne (4,521,770), and further in view of Zelinsky et al (4,837,710).

Regarding claim 1, Muta discloses that the claimed feature of in a computer system, a method of displaying information, comprising the steps of:

a) accessing a flag ["capability information"; 413] indicating a display mode of a display screen [211,220] of a computer system [210+240], wherein display mode [W/B, multi gradation, color] indicates a display capability of display screen; b) an application program [210,215] of computer system making a call ["input information", 309] to request a display attribute [i.e. color] for an object to be displayed on display screen [211,220]; c) in response to request, indexing a table [320] with flag and an object identifier [315] to obtain a display attribute ["rendering instruction", 331], wherein object identifier identifies object, and wherein table is located externally of application program

[210,215] and comprises a list of object identifiers and a plurality of display attribute lists, each of display attribute lists having a display attribute associated with each of object identifiers, wherein at least two of display attribute lists correspond to display capabilities of display screen; d) application program displaying object on display screen [211,220] with display attribute [331], wherein display capability of display screen is transparent to application program. (See Abstract, Fig 3, Fig 4, Fig 6, Fig 11, col 2 line 26-47, col 13 line 17-45)

Muta does not specifically disclose that “a flag indicating a display mode of a display screen”. However, using of a flag is well-known in the art to represent a information as a marker of some type used by a computer in processing or interpreting information. (See “Microsoft Computer Dictionary”, third edition) Therefore, this would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant’s invention to use flag into the teaching of Muta, as using of flag is advantageously desirable in Muta’s system for effectively indicating “capability information.”

Also, Muta does not explicitly disclose that indexing a table, which comprises a list of object identifiers and an associated display attribute lists. However, such limitations are shown in the teaching of Rhyne [“object identifier”, “color attributes” in “color look-up table”,] (See Abstract, Fig 8 -12, col 2 line 24-52, col 3 line 32-44, col 3 line 63-col 4 line 13) It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate the teaching of Rhyne into the teaching of Muta, in order to provide “interactively

executing the editing functions with a minimum of hardware alteration" (See col 2 line 15-32 in Rhyne), as such enhancement is also advantageously desirable in the teaching of Muta for rendering optimized image upon the display device effectively.

Also, the combination of Muta and Rhyne do not specifically disclose that "at least two of display attribute lists correspond to display capabilities of display screen." However, such limitation is shown in the teaching of Zelinsky et al. ["color/attribute table", "attribute translation table"; 4-28, which include two display attribute lists ["monochrome attributes", "color display attributes"] corresponds to display capabilities of display screen ["monochrome screen", "color screen"] (See Abstract, Fig 2, Fig 3, Fig 5A-5F, Fig 6A-6E, col 1 line 40-col 2 line 27) It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate the teaching of Zelinsky into the teaching of Muta and Rhyne, in order to effectively provide proper display attribute corresponding to the display device's type, as such improvement is also advantageously desirable in the teaching of Muta and Rhyne for rendering the optimized image upon its type of display device.

Regarding claim 2, Muta discloses that plurality of display attribute lists comprise a first and a second, and wherein:

First display attribute list has all of its associated display attributes being color ["color image"]; Second display attribute list has all of its associated display attributes being monochrome ["2 gradations W/B"]. (See col 9 line 8-15)

Regarding claim 3, Muta discloses that plurality of display attribute lists comprise a third, and where third display attribute list has all of its associated display attributes being a gray scale value ["multi gradations W/B"]. (See Fig 11)

Regarding claim 4, refer to the discussion for the claim 1 hereinabove, Zelinsky et al discloses that display attribute lists has all of its associated display attributes as being colors which are substantially different from each other, such that debugging application program is facilitated. (See Fig 3, Fig 4B)

Regarding claim 5, Muta discloses that the step of application program [210] changing at least one of the display attributes in at least one of display attribute lists. (See Fig 3, Fig 11; Also See Fig 8-12 in Rhyne)

Regarding claim 6, Muta discloses that the step of application program causing changes to the display attributes to remain in effect when the next application program runs. (See Fig 3, Fig 11)

Regarding claim 7, Muta discloses that the step of each time the computer system starts up, assigning a random color to each undefined color [default], such that if the application program changes one of display attributes to one of undefined colors, then the display attribute of object displayed on display screen is likely to be different each time the computer system starts up. (See Fig 3, Fig 11)

Regarding claim 8, Muta discloses that the step of a user of computer system changing display mode. (See Abstract line 1-9, col 13 line 26-32)

Regarding claim 9, Muta discloses that color table resides in an operating system of computer system. (See Fig 3, Fig 11)

Regarding claim 10, Claim 10 is the corresponding computer system of claim 1. Thus, the rejection to claim 1 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 10.

Regarding claims 11-12, Muta disclose that computer system is a portable/palm sized computer system. (See Abstract line 3)

Regarding claims 13-20, claims 13-20 are similar in scope to the claims 1-18, and thus the rejections to claims 1-18 hereinabove are also applicable to claims 13-20.

Regarding claim 21, Muta discloses that application program changes the at least one of the display attributes in the at least one of display attribute lists without user interaction. ['changing color attribute data based upon capability information']. (See Fig 3, Fig 4)

Response to Arguments/Amendments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Chung whose telephone number is (703) 306-3419. He can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays from 7:30am- 5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael, Razavi, can be reached at (703) 305-4713.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal
Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office
whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

djc
December 3, 2003



MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600